DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 225 SP 034 222

AUTHOR Pellow, Randall A.; Kuhns, Polly
TITLE The "Re" Maelstrom of Educational Reform: Restructure, Renewal, Reform, Recreate, Reconstitute, Redesign, Refurbish, Rethink, Redraft, Restrengthen.
PUB DATE [92]
NOTE 47p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Excellence in Education; Higher Education; Outcomes of Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; Public Policy; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Educators; Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS Collaboratives; *Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

When evaluation is applied to teacher education programs in higher education, a myriad of issues emerge which make assessment complex and critical, especially during the era of reform. The purpose of this paper is to establish a comprehensive overview of assessment processes and reform efforts in teacher education programs. Organized into five sections, the report examines: (1) the nature of program evaluation (an historical overview, current trends in program evaluation, and Federal and State initiatives); (2) issues on restructuring teacher preparation programs; (3) teaching as a profession, alternative certification, the profession of teacher education, and clinical field experiences; (4) basic education reform efforts at State and Federal levels (mentoring programs, school-site management and teacher empowerment, outcome-based measurements, reports on basic education reform efforts, and Federal initiatives); and (5) school-university collaboration. In compiling a literature review, over 100 sources were utilized to discern historical and current practices regarding assessment procedures and resultant reform efforts. These sources are noted in a reference list. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353225

THE "RE" MAELSTROM OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM:

Restructure, Renewal, Reform, Recreate, Reconstitute,
Redesign, Refurbish, Rethink, Redraft, Restrengthen

Dr. Randall A. Pellow
Professor of Teacher Education

Dr. Polly Kuhns
Associate Professor of Education
Administration & Foundations

Shippensburg University
Shippensburg, PA 17257

SP 034 222

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE "RE" MAELSTROM OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM:

Restructure, Renewal, Reform, Recreate, Reconstitute,

Redesign, Refurbish, Rethink, Redraft, Restrenghthen

Introduction

The processes for collecting empirical data and making informed decisions about program effectiveness fall under the realm of evaluation. When evaluation is applied to teacher education programs in higher education, a myriad of issues emerge which make assessment complex and critical, especially during the era of reform. However, by examining and analyzing these issues, evaluators can hopefully maintain and/or enhance the overall quality of these programs.

During the initial phases of this study, computer searches for references were conducted at Ezra Lehman Library, Shippenburg University and the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C. In compiling this literature review, over 100 sources were utilized to discern historical and current practices regarding the assessment procedures and resultant reform efforts to teacher education programs.

The Winter, 1991 issue of Theory Into Practice was a very beneficial source of information. Other helpful journals were Educational Leadership, Phi Delta Kappan, and the Journal of Teacher Education. Several conference proceedings provided useful insights. In addition, several agencies such as the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Association of Teacher Educators, Association of American Colleges, Carnegie Foundation, U.S. Department of Education,

American Council on Education, and ERIC on Teacher Education supplied reports and books of particular interest. Jossey-Bass Publishers published an educational reform movement series, which included Goodlad's study. These sources, as well as many others, are fully delineated in the reference list.

This report was organized according to the subheadings below so that a more comprehensive overview of assessment processes and reform efforts in teacher education programs could be established. The subheadings are as follows:

The Nature of Program Evaluation

Historical Overview of Program Evaluation

Current Trends in Program Evaluation

Federal and State Initiatives on Program Evaluation

Issues on Restructuring Teacher Preparation Programs

Restructuring Teacher Education Programs

Teaching as a Profession

Alternative Certification

The Profession of Teacher Education

Clinical Field Experiences

Basic Education Reform Efforts at State and Federal Levels

Mentoring Programs

School-Site Management and Teacher Empowernment

Outcome-based Measurements

Reports on Basic Education Reform Efforts

Federal Initiatives

School-University Collaboration

The News on Reform Is Not All Bad

Reform Efforts Will Fail Unless . . .

The Nature of Program Evaluation

Education has been under severe scrutiny for almost a decade. Basic education and college teacher preparation programs both have been labelled as ineffective (Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, 1983; A Nation Prepared: Teachers For the 21st Century, 1986; Tomorrow's Teachers, 1986). Johnston and his associates (1990, p. 1) confirmed this notion by citing, "It is widely recognized that the best way to break the cycle by which ineffective teaching reproduces itself over generations is to improve dramatically the quality of teachers entering the system. As a group, however, America's colleges and universities so far have failed to meet this challenge."

In a 1985 publication, the Association of American Colleges highlighted the learning-assessment connection by noting that it was "scandalous" that colleges failed to assess the impacts of their teaching (Hutchings & Marchese, 1990, p. 16). Howey and Zimpher (1989, pp. 5-6) chimed:

> Little, in fact, is known in a fine-grained manner about the nature of teacher preparation curricula, the instructional activities of the faculty attached to these curricula, and the frequency, timelines, and quality of opportunities which prospective teachers have for learning ... there is hardly consensus on the nature and scope of these problems, let alone the most efficacious means for resolving them.

Public schools have recently endeavored to find ways to retain, motivate, and attract good teachers to promote greater effectiveness (Cresap, McCormick and Paget, 1984), but unless colleges and universities take full responsibility to ensure proper preparedness, there is little schools can do.

Historical Overview of Program Evaluation

Assessment processes in higher education have been historically significant, and thus, indicators of the importance of this issue over time. According to Hutchings and Marchese (1990), assessment measures were in place during the 19th century as the American College proclaimed that receivers of the bachelor's degree must face comprehensive examinations, often oral in nature, conducted by person's outside the education arena. These writers noted, "Underlying the practice was an assumption, carried over from English universities, that instruction and evaluation ought properly to be distinguished and be done by different parties" (p. 15).

During the latter part of the century, the rise in student numbers and the increase in subject availability deterred comprehensive exams and led the way to individual course assessment and the assigning of credit value which addressed the "continental university model in which 'good teaching' meant knowing one's subject deeply and speaking clearly about it" (p. 15).

Worthen and Sanders (1991) acknowledged contributions from Thorndike and his students on educational testing in the 1920s and 1930s which subsequently led to norm-referenced testing. During the 1930s, the comprehensive examination was reinstated but focused on major areas

of study. In the 1950s, Tyler initiated the concept of criterion-referenced testing.

Sputnik I catapulted the U.S. Congress into a flurry of activity culminating in the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958. It was not until the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965 that real directives toward evaluating program effectiveness were federally mandated (Worthen & Sanders, 1991). Monies became available to provide training of professionals in the field of evaluation.

The late 1960s witnessed a plethora of evaluation paradigms. Although many professionals were predicting the demise of formal evaluation after the federal funds dissipated, this enterprise tenaciously survived and even matured during the next two decades (Worthen and Sanders, 1991, p. 5). Based upon the embryonic models of evaluation for ESEA programs, evaluation processes began to flourish. Rather than just assessing a program's merits, Cronbach (cited in Greene and McClintock, 1991) advocated that evaluation could be used to improve programs as they were occurring. Scriven (cited in Greene and McClintock, 1991) refined this distinction by labelling these processes as formative and summative approaches to evaluation.

In the 70s and 80s, evaluators began to see evaluation as assessing performance on multiple criteria. Worthen and Sanders (1991, pp. 5-10) discussed five trends of evaluation that have emerged as the:

Emergence of Career Opportunities;

Development of Preparation Programs;

Institutionalization of Evaluation;

Development as a Profession; and

Paradigmatic and Methodological Shifts in Evaluation.

In a similar vein, Altschuld and Thomas (1991, pp. 23-25) extolled the maturation and growth of evaluation under the following trend areas:

a) growth in what constitutes the field;

b) advancement of methodologies;

c) formation of a national association and evaluation journals;

d) greater emphasis on evaluation criteria;

e) impact of external factors.

A phrase used to describe those assessment activities that measure the impact of instruction in higher education is known as **teaching evaluation**. Ory (1991) noted three teaching evaluation trends that have emerged on typical campuses. They are student ratings, peer evaluation, and faculty self-evaluations.

The trend toward faculty members "policing" their own ranks falls under the rubric of peer evaluation committees. Established by collective bargaining agreements and/or administrative fiat, this policy is under scrutiny. Because of its controversial (and sometimes inflammatory) nature and its time consuming efforts, the function of these committees appears to be changing. Ory (1991, p. 33) cited that "while the requirement of classroom visitation by peers has probably been reduced in the last four years, peer review of course materials has most likely increased."

Emerging in the 70s, it became common practice for administrators and peer evaluation committees to view student ratings as one means of tangible evidence of a professor's teaching ability. It also became

common practice for professors to use these ratings in promoting their causes for higher salaries and/or promotions.

According to findings from a 1990 study, 80% of the institutions surveyed reported some sort of assessment activity of their academic programs. Of those responding, ". . . 94 per cent said they were evaluating basic skills, 67 percent were assessing general education and liberal studies, and 62 percent were measuring students' progress in their majors (Blumenstyk and Magner, 1990, p. A11).

By 1991, the evaluation movement gained legitimacy with the creation of the American Evaluation Association. In examining the educational merits of teacher preparation programs, evaluation has become an integral part of the process. Evaluation has provided new channels for research and new possibilities for the teaching of evaluation. In a 1991 issue of Theory Into Practice on educational evaluation, Altschuld (1991, p. 2) characterized these trends as ". . . the electricity of evaluation."

Current Trends in Program Evaluation

Worthen and Sanders (1991) noted that every evaluation trend at the higher education level points to more evaluation of programs. It has become necessary for evaluators to use a diversity of qualitative and quantitative strategies to assess educational programs. Given the variety and complexity of program components to assess, evaluation methodology has evolved into **frames**. That is, "the design of an evaluation, thus, can be framed as a response to the information needs of five audience categories (policymakers, program administrators,

operating personnel at local sites, interest groups and observers, user constituencies . . ." (Greene & McClintock, 1991, p. 17). When these five categories are applied to the CIPP model -- program context, input, process, and product, -- the resulting effect is 20 different frames of information to consider in program evaluation (Greene & McClintock, 1991).

Thus, one major trend in assessing teacher preparation programs is using **multiple frame** or **mixed-method approaches** to program evaluation. According to Greene and McClintock (1991, p. 20), program evaluation has become multi-dimensional toward applied research in four important areas:

a) a variety of paradigms for guiding evaluation purposes and methods;

b) multiple frames for evaluation, including utilization, program development and implementation, and program components in constant transaction with a context of organizational, community, cultural, and political processes;

c) more careful specification of the underlying theory of the program being studied in order to understand how programs function from different stakeholder perspectives; and

d) a need for mixed-method evaluation approaches that will adequately represent alternative paradigms and portray multiple program perspectives.

Another major trend was noted in newly created dissemination agencies. In conjunction with the Association for the Study of Higher

Education (ASHE), ERIC Clearinghouse recently began to prepare reports published by The George Washington University's School of Education and Human Development. Under the heading of ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, this agency has several reports dealing with higher education issues. In one of these reports, Toombs and Tierney (1992) asserted that renewal is a series of small, incremental steps guided by long-range vision that leads toward a result. These authors contended that three precepts need to be in place for viable renewal to occur. They argued for 1) a conceptual framework that incorporates the professional expectations of students, 2) the total body of knowledge that makes up an area of study, and 3) the outcome expectations of society (Toombs and Tierney, 1992).

Federal and State Initiatives on Program Evaluation

Federal and state legislative agencies also have entered the evaluation arena to improve the quality of teacher education programs. State mandates are one of the major differences of educational reform today as compared to efforts in the past and have definitely associated reform with assessment issues at the higher education level. Ewell (no date given, p. 1) confirmed with ". . . the 'high ground' of assessment was quickly seized by state policy makers who saw in assessment a powerful 'lever for change' for improving quality in undergraduate education." El-Khawas (cited in Ewell, no date given, p. 1) reported that over 50% of the institutions responding to a 1989 national survey stated that their chief reason for conducting assessment activities was an existing or anticipated state mandate.

There are many educators who take considerable umbrage with state lawmaking initiatives. However, it is increasingly clear that state policymakers are becoming more proactive in designing legislation that defines the delivery of quality in teacher education programs while concomitantly embracing and demanding accountability.

The Virginia legislature recently passed a law aimed at evaluating all university and college undergraduate programs (Hutchings and Marchese, 1990, p. 10). Guidelines have been issued by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) "to investigate means by which student achievement may be measured to assure the citizens of Virginia of continuing high quality of higher education in the Commonwealth" (Hutchings and Marchese, 1990, p. 18). The guidelines were put into effect in 1987 and the efforts toward implementation were negatively received at the University of Virginia. A reversal occured in attitude at the University in 1990 when assessment issues became less centrally controlled, and focused on faculty, broad-based conversations. It was recommended by the acting provost to "give assessment back to the faculty" (p. 21).

Since 1987, Connecticut has had an assessment mandate; one that requests each institution to design its own plan for assessment. Unlike the University of Virginia, the University of Connecticut's ". . . effort predates the mandate and has been faculty driven" (Hutchings and Marchese, 1990, p. 22). Committees with old and new conversations continue to address the assessment issue.

Hutchings and Marchese (1990) found in their investigation of assessment procedures several factors that make assessment difficult on

college campuses. One was that assessment connotes **shared learning** -- a belief that lends itself to the issue of accountability and a concept that generates questions. Another factor was the **apprehension of assessment** due to the broad-based meaning that engulfs comprehensive knowledge and not just what is learned in one's own course. The adage "If a man does not keep pace with his companions" (Longfellow), is surely unsettling to many faculty who want autonomy. The third factor relates to **promotion and tenure** guidelines. As stated by Young of the Academic Search Consultation Service (in Hutchings & Marchese, 1990, p. 27), "Until evidence of teaching effectiveness is taken seriously as a criterion for hiring, promotion, tenure, and merit, those faculty who take teaching (and assessment) seriously may continue to function at the margins". The last factor pertains to the **relationship between the university and the states** with all the implications that surround hierarchical mandates.

McClenney (1990, p. 54) recommended steps that can be taken to address the assessment issue as:

* we must continue to raise insistent probing questions about the essential purposes and outcomes of undergraduate education.
* we must achieve greater coherence in policy and its implentation (sic).
* highly related, is the need to re-think and redesign incentive and reward structures.
* we must expand the assessment conversation.

Issues on Restructuring Teacher Preparation Programs

When the effectiveness of teacher education programs was examined, evaluators initially look at the recipients of teacher education degrees. According to some critics, the caliber of students was questioned especially in the area of college program selection and occupational choice. Kennedy (1991, p. 660) stated that "there is evidence that those who enter teacher education generally score lower on tests of academic achievement than those who enter other career tracks." Weaver (in Clark, 1989, p. 46) corroborated this contention by noting:

> (a) SAT and related aptitude tests scores for seniors choosing education are lower than the national mean, (b) the mean scores for education registrants and graduates are also low, (c) individuals who stay in teaching tend to have lower SAT scores than those who leave teaching, and (d) Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores for education majors are also low.

Opp (1989) indicated similar alarming trends but addressed high school grade point averages. He (1989, p. 45) cited, "Among freshmen with an A- or higher high school grade point average, the percentage interested in teaching has declined by two-thirds from 22.1 percent in 1966 to 7.4 percent in 1988."

However, Matczynski, Siler, McLaughlin, and Smith (cited in Clark, 1989, p. 49) offered evidence "that the GPA's of teachers are comparable to or even exceed those students in non-education programs." Clark (1989, p. 50) reviewed the institutions studied by Matczynski and his associates and found "that the GPA studies compared performance of

education and non-education students within institutions that have low average SATs relative to other universities and that the GPA institutions register a high proportion of education students." Such research implies needed attention to: selectivity of students, attractiveness of education as a chosen field, and efforts applied to strengthening education students' aptitudes (Clark, 1989).

Regarding prospective teachers, Wilson (1990) confined her concerns to the conditioning received by students accepted into teacher education programs. Describing this conditioning as "deeply rooted and insidious" (p. 206), she assailed the educational system for creating "disenfranchised learners " (p. 207). In a reflective mode, she described the paradox by stating, "It's not their fault that they're passive; they learned to act that way in classrooms. We taught them to behave in school, but we forgot to teach them how to learn" (p. 207).

The emphases needed to make education attractive for the more able was an issue quite frequently addressed in the literature. According to Opp (1989, p. 45), education selected as a chosen field declined "from 13th place in 1966 to 26th place in 1988" indicating that teaching is attracting a smaller portion of well-prepared freshmen now than in previous years.

Why are young teaching prospects less motivated to choose teaching as a career? One reason may be the anticipation of comparable salaries with other four year college graduates. However, this reason may not be as important as it was in the past due to increases in starting teacher salaries in many states (Opp, 1989).

Another more cogent reason for non-selection was the **negative image** that is associated with teacher education. Roth (1989) succinctly encapsulated the germane theme of this issue. He noted:

> Teacher education has never had a good image, either with the public or with those in higher education. Recently, confidence in teacher education programs seems to have slipped further, and this slide is being reflected in state policies. It is ironic that the continuing erosion of confidence in teacher education has emanated from a reform movement that has focused largely on ways of strengthening the preparation of teachers (p. 319).

Low teacher morale was often ascribed as a reason for not entering or leaving the profession. In support of teachers, Johnston and his associates (1990, p. 12) cited, "A multitude of factors combine to produce the failure these appraisals (tests) bring to light. School environments inimical to learning, lack of support from parents, underinvestment in education by society at large . . . frustrate and compromise efforts of the best classroom teachers."

Restructuring Teacher Education Programs

Teaching as a Profession

Several past national reports emanating from agencies such as The Southern Regional Education Board Report, the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Governors' Association, the Education Commission of the States and the Educational Testing Service confirmed the need to improve the

preparation of teachers and promoted efforts for reform (cited in Roth, 1989).

One of the first committees established to investigate the poorly acclaimed nature of this nation's educational institutions was the Holmes Group. One of the objectives of this group was to study programs in higher education. This group was significant because of the make-up of the committee; it was the first time college deans met to discuss "the reconstruction of the entire education profession, most especially, teacher education (Lanier, 1988, p.18). According to Darling-Hammond (cited in Meek, 1988, p. 14), the "effort toward unity among teacher educators is again a statement of professionalism - because the profession is the collective."

The Holmes Group, along with the Carnegie's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century were catalytic reports that led to the establishment of a National Board for the Professional Teaching Standards which is creating a profession of teaching. Shulman (1988) also was instrumental in conceptualizing the Board's functions.

The main thrust of the Board will be to apply effort to improve teaching through the issuing of national certification. According to Kodish (1991, p. 4), the Board will receive 5 million in federal funds to supplement its efforts. It is believed that the implementation of such a system will increase public awareness and respect, lead to greater mobility and career opportunities, and make the profession more appealing to our college students. Inherent in the recommendations, Orlosky (1988, p. 15) noted is ". . . that these teachers will be

compensated beyond their normal pay schedule as a concomitant of meeting board certified standards."

The National Board will present universities and colleges with new challenges in preparing students for the Board's assessment. It is believed that the assessment will be composed of various techniques which may include interviews, portfolio reviews, teaching observation and completion of specially designed exercises conducted at assessment (Shulman, 1988; Brandt, 1988; Kodish, 1991). This, of course, implies the need for many colleges of teacher education to assess and perhaps revamp their established programs.

Alternative Certification

There are a number of initiatives underway collectively known as **alternative certification**. New programs in teacher education that deviate from the normal four year teacher preparation curriculum are considered to be alternative certification. They center on concentrating on general education and subject matter with little or no courses in pedagogy, eliminating undergraduate teacher preparation altogether, and emphasizing mentoring programs as a means to providing adequate pedagogical theory and practice.

In labelling the teacher education program as "an endangered species," Roth (1989, p. 320) summarized the characteristics of alternative routes to certification as:

* they allow an individual to take charge of a classroom before completing the usual preparation program;

* they sometimes do not require an individual to complete the usual preparation to achieve certification;
* they accept nontraditional students (those with bachelor's degrees in other fields, those with experience in business and industry, retirees, and so on);
* they bypass traditional preparation programs through nontraditional or accelerated programs; and
* they are established by state policy.

Former Secretary of Education Bennett (cited in Roth, 1989, p. 320) kindled the fires of skepticism for traditional teacher preparation when he stated he was not yet ". . . persuaded that any teacher education course exists that all teachers should have. Teaching is still an act of individual virtuosity. Some people can do it and some people can't and I don't care how many courses people have, it does not make them any better."

Dill (1990) cited alternative certification as one of the most promising approaches to solving many of the problems in the preparation of teachers. "One reason that alternative certification is so promising," explained Dill, "is that it functions outside the university incentive system" (p. 199). She continued with, "A delivery system for teacher education is appropriate if it is bonded to the public schools by service and research. Wherever such links are forged, quality emerges. It is time to demonopolize, demythologize and demystify the university setting" (p. 199).

Wise (1990) noted that Massachusetts has enacted a fifth year for prospective teachers which would require them to major in the field they

plan to teach. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education identified seven alternative paradigms for extended teacher preparation programs (Howey and Zimpher, 1989, p. 4).

Sponsored by Senator Carl Parker, Texas State Bill 994 went into effect on September 1, 1991. It has eliminated undergraduate degrees in education and limited required credit hours to 18 in UDG teacher education courses (Watts, 1989). This bill is meant to place prospective candidates in field-based settings as a collaborative project among the university, regional education service center, and the school district.

A complaint was filed with National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) stating that because of SB 994, Texas institutions cannot meet NCATE governance standards. Parker emphatically retorted, "NCATE seems committed to maintaining control of teacher education, but is doing little to control quality" (cited in Watts, 1989, p. 312). He challenged, "I don't believe it (NCATE) is sincerely interested in promoting quality in teacher education, and I have no confidence in its ability . . ." (p. 313). Billed as the "great Texas shootout," it has created a titanic struggle over the issue of what agency "has responsibility for and authority over teacher preparation" (Watts, 1989, p. 314).

The Profession of Teacher Education

John Goodlad is one of this country's foremost proponents for educational reform in teacher preparation programs. Goodlad is the director of the Center for Educational Renewal at the University of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Washington in Seattle. The Center's staff embarked upon a five year project called the Study of the Education of Educators (SEE) in which the histories of twenty-nine (29) teacher education institutions were examined and analyzed. The results have been reported in two 1990 books titled Teachers For Our Nation's Schools and Places Where Teachers Are Taught and several journals.

From his studies on teacher preparation programs, five clusters of intrusive findings emerged which led Goodlad (1990a, p. 186) to accede, ". . . that the necessary conditions for vigorous, coherent, and self-renewing programs of teacher preparation are not in place." Goodlad did not deal specifically with assessment issues at higher education institutions but he did offer five theme areas that need to be addressed if any improvement of teacher education programs is to occur.

Based upon interviews, Goodlad (1990a) concluded that university officials have an **unclear mission and identity** resulting in the perception that teacher education programs have less importance than other programs. Goodlad (1990a, p. 188) lamented, ". . . it is fair to describe teacher education as a neglected enterprise." Faculty members were accorded **low prestige and status** in colleges and universities preparing teachers. A concomitant concern was the level of **professors anxiety**; they perceived that teaching and teacher preparation reduces incentives and rewards. The Carnegie Foundation's recent study College: The Undergraduate Experience revealed that ". . . while faculty members feel great pressure to publish, the commitment to support requisite research is, on many campuses, seriously lacking (Boyer, 1991, p. 1). Goodlad (1990a) also addressed in teacher preparation programs the

professional socialization process was weak lending to a **lack of identity among the student body**. Secondary students aligned themselves with their academic departments. Finally, **program coherence** was disrupted by the intrusion of large regulatory agencies (Goodlad, 1990a, pp. 186-189). However, regarding this criticism, Wise (1990, p. 201) noted, "Some states have now begun to coordinate their program approval process with NCATE," lending support for national standards for teacher education.

Tom (1987) perceived one precondition to any reform of the teacher preparation programs as teaming and integrating across courses. He noted, "Such linking is possible if the same team of professors teaches the professional content on campus and concurrently supervises novices in the field" (p. 32).

Clinical Field Experiences

In searching the literature, it was resoundingly clear that the clinical phase is a vital component of teacher preparation. However, there was little consensus of opinion as to how this aspect should be reshaped.

Historically, students are required to observe for so many hours in the schools, to conduct field work during their method courses, and then to student teach in one or two classrooms. Typically, a school administrator asks a teacher to "volunteer" his/her services as a cooperating teacher. For that role, he/she is lured by a small stipend, or free tuition for a college course. Indeed, some volunteers feel coerced by administrators or request a student teacher because of

unmanageable students or class size. Goodlad (1990a, p. 190) stated, "Clearly, the important clinical component of most of the programs we studied suffered seriously from a shortage of well-qualified cooperating teachers . . . . " Coercion and volunteering would appear to be tenuous regulators of quality control in teacher education programs.

Traditionally, a college faculty member is selected as a supervisor to help the student teacher bridge the gap between theory and practice. This person has often taught methods courses. However, **the role of university supervisor was viewed as one of the least prestigious ones**. This supervisor may spend two or more prime time hours in travelling to and from a school site. Indeed, many supervisors are selected from a pool of applicants not in the mainstream of academe, such as adjunct faculty or graduate students.

Goodlad (1990a) and his associates affirmed these recurring selection practices. He further noted, ". . . and when there was disparity of teaching methods between the university courses and the methods specified by the school district, student teachers opted to use the latter" (p. 190).

Based upon surveys, interviews, and field-site visits, Goodlad (1990c, pp. 270-306) and his colleagues proposed nineteen (19) postulates upon which to redesign teacher education programs. The central theme of their proposals was the creation of a ". . . '**center of pedagogy**,' devoted exclusively to the preparation of educators for our schools and . . . advancement of pedagogy" (Goodlad, 1990a, p.192). Wise (1990, p. 201) further explained these as "the advocates of

professional development schools mean to select and prepare senior faculty members for their roles as mentors and managers of genuine teaching internships." Shulman promulgated these agencies to be called "assessment centers" in which performance assessment exercises aligned with real world problems be the main menu for determining quality.

However, Wisniewski (1990, p. 196) questioned, "Do we reform colleges of education in order to improve teacher education? Or do we pull the education of educators out of colleges of education and create a new institution." In an earlier book on redesigning teacher education programs, Orlosky (1988, p. viii) cited:

> Institutions interested in reform must decide whether to overhaul their programs, continue present practices, make slight modifications, or eliminate teacher preparation programs altogether. This report takes the position that careful modification rather than comprehensive revision will enable the teaching profession to deal with problems

Put differently, Roth (1989, p. 322) consolidated the options as:

* moving teacher education into the schools and out of the institutions of higher education altogether;
* retaining teacher education programs in institutions of higher education but concentrating them into shorter time periods to provide easier entry into teaching;
* retaining teacher education programs in higher education but significantly strengthening the programs and their credibility.

The later option has been addressed by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) through its efforts to strengthen assessment and as a result increase credibility and quality (Roth, 1989).

The results of Goodlad and his associates were criticized by several researchers as being redundant and devoid of examining efforts at current reform with NCATE standards and other institutions (Dill, 1990; Wilson, 1990; Wisniewski, 1990). Wisniewski (1990, p. 196) commented, "Could not an attempt have been made to study institutions where the reform process was more advanced?" Wilson (1990) also viewed Goodlad's work with skepticism. She implored researchers to conduct more careful in-depth examinations over time as to how teachers are prepared. In reference to this, she stated, "Kamikaze data-collection visits are not a reliable proxy for the daily work of teacher education" (p. 209).

Meade (1991) suggested restructuring student teaching as a teaching internship enterprise whereby the intern is paid much like interns in law, medicine, and business. He proposed that the classroom teachers would function as clinical supervisors with college faculty serving as professional peers training the clinical teachers. The clinical teacher would be considered to have a different role, not necessarily a better teacher. He also advocated that methods courses be taught at the school site and that clinical teachers receive financial support as do other faculty members.

Basic Education Reform Efforts at State and Federal Levels

In a recent issue of Proteus dedicated to the teaching profession, Hockersmith (1991, p. vi) noted that there are several bold reform initiatives under way across our country -- from school restructuring to site-based management to teacher empowerment. She proclaimed that "our efforts are not measured by that which has been done but by how much more (in the opinion of the 'bashers') should have been done (p. vi). In her upbeat tribute to teacher education in which she acknowledged there are many dedicated, dynamic teachers, she also noted the need for many more of these teachers with, "This is a mission no educator can afford to neglect" (p. vii).

Mentoring Programs

One effort to improve the quality of teaching was in the establishment of **mentoring programs**. Bey and Holmes (1990, p. viii) defined mentoring programs as being:

> . . . a relationship of experienced teachers working with new teachers to inquire about and strengthen instructional competence . . . It is a process that says to people coming into teaching that observing, meeting, discussing, and making informed decisions about teaching and learning is professional work.

Odell (1990, p. 12) noted, "The primary objective of mentoring beginning teachers is to assist their professional growth." She suggested that

beginning teachers will resort to less effective teaching methods without these programs.

According to a recent survey, 31 states had implemented mentoring programs, also known as teacher induction programs, while only 8 states reported absolutely no activity in this arena (Odell, 1990, p. 5).

Goodlad (1990a, p. 185) noted his opposition to mentoring programs by succinctly stating, "Rather the connecting of schooling and the education of new teachers has virtually guaranteed that the status quo would be protected: tomorrow's teachers are mentored by today's." He launched a scorching indictment against mentoring programs with:

> Critics who would make mentoring under experienced teachers the whole of professional preparation for beginners have overlooked the research on prevailing school and classroom procedures and have ignored the tyrannical control that these ingrained procedures exercise over teachers who lack both the intellectual tools for critiquing them and an adequate awareness of better alternatives (p. 190).

School-Site Management and Teacher Empowerment

Another basic education reform effort frequently addressed in the literature was **school-site management** where teachers are more **empowered** to participate in the school's decision-making processes. Meadows (1990, p. 545) referred to it as ". . . shared leadership and shared decision-making." The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1988, p. 14) delineated, "Teacher empowerment means shared leadership in which the teacher is regarded as a professional."

Emanating from a variety of task forces' reports in the 1980s, Conley and Bacharach (1990, pp. 539-540) asserted, "For school-site management to succeed, it must be developed with the specific goal of creating a professional work environment for teachers. Without this goal, school-site management may become just another bureaucratic mode of control masquerading as a real reform." The Carnegie Foundation's (1988, p. 17) report assertively stated, "What is urgently needed - in the next phase of school reform - is a deep commitment to make teachers partners in renewal, at all levels."

Outcome-based Assessment

The movement toward assessment of teacher preparation programs and school reform is currently falling under the rubric of **outcomes-based measurements**. Drexler and Stambaugh (1992, p. 4) defined ". . . outcome-based education means a shift away from rigid subject-hour (time spent in a classroom) requirements to a system based on results." Bauer (1992, p. 7) noted, "Outcome-based education says students are the workers learning the product. Teachers are the tools that help the workers finish the product." Spady (1991-1992, p. 2) noted outcome-based:

> is a culminating demonstration of the entire range of learning experiences and capabilities that underlie it, and occurs in a performance context that directly influences what it is and how it is carried out.

Pennsylvania has shifted toward an outcome-based system of education with the changes being piloted in 150 school districts during

1993 and the regulations becoming effective in all districts by 1995 (Drexler and Stambaugh, 1992).

Reports on Basic Education Reform Efforts

Ginsberg and Berry (1990) reported about school reform efforts in South Carolina. That state has recently infused 200 million dollars into its budget toward educational reform. Surveys showed that South Carolina's educators support the idea of reform, ". . . but many find its implementation troubling" (p. 550).

Ginsberg and Berry's findings echoed those of the Carnegie Foundation's Report Card on School Reform: The Teachers Speak (1988). One disturbing result among the 13,500 teachers surveyed was that "half the teachers believe that, overall, morale within the profession has substantially declined since 1983" (1988, p. 17). Indeed, ". . . nearly 70 percent said the national push for school reform deserves a 'C' or less" (1988, p. 5). The writers of the Foundation's report queried, "Still, we are troubled that the nation's teachers remain so skeptical. Why is it that teachers, of all people, are demoralized and largely unimpressed by the reform action taken?" (1988, p. 16).

The Foundation's writers asserted that ". . . the push has been concerned more with regulation than renewal. Reforms have typically focused on graduation requirements, student achievement, teacher preparation and testing . . . " (p. 17). For the next phase of reform, the Foundation cogently pleaded for " . . . a deep commitment to make teachers partners in renewal, at all levels" (p. 17). However, the

Carnegie report only focused on reform in the public and private school sectors, not on the preparation of teachers.

Federal Initiatives

The Federal government has also entered the educational reform arena. Uncloaked in the document America 2000: An Education Strategy, the Bush administration plans to infuse 150 million into the research and development for redesigning the American school system. However, Kaplan (1991, p. 36) launched a cynical commentary on this plan as characterized by the following statements:

> The propelling theme . . . is the highly dubious proposition that our public schools are beyond hope and repair. Their rotten performance, swollen bureaucracies, and outdated methods consign them to education's junkyard. But they will need to be replaced by something really grabby, goes the reasoning. . . .
>
> How can a landmark federal document on redesigning and reconstituting education in America sail serenely past the issues of race, class, and economics in our cities as though they scarcely existed?

On a different note, Rothman (1991) reported the formation of the National Education Goals Panel sponsored by the Bush Administration. The Panel is responsible for creating ". . . a new assessment system which would measure college students' progress on six national education goals . . . " (p. 18) and ". . . would measure students' critical

thinking and problem solving skills as well as subject matter knowledge" (p.20).

School-University Collaboration

While some reformers wrote about school reform in the public and private school sectors, others penned opinions about reform in teacher education institutions of higher education. A minority of writers took a more wholistic viewpoint and combined the dichotomy of school reform and teacher preparation reform. Recently evolving under the rubric of **school-college partnerships or collaboration**, the literature clearly suggested this renewal effort as gaining impetus. The literature also strongly suggested that the quality of teaching and teacher education will need to be accommodated in order for reform efforts to be successful and effective. In the writers' opinions, basic education reform cannot be divorced from teacher preparation reform. Neither can successfully occur in a vacuum, isolated from one another.

However, the literature was rifed with suggestions on the rift between basic education teachers and university teacher educators. Eubanks and Parish (1990) encapsulated the chasm when they stated, "University professors are forever viewed by practitioners as ineffectual and detached agents who may know but cannot do; practitioners are forever viewed by university professors as people only interested in learning a technique ". . . than in understanding the broader picture" (p. 196).

Sizer (1987a) attempted to bridge the chasm between school reform and teacher preparation when he stated, "Therefore, in my view,

teacher education programs must involve both the coping with the 'real world' and involvement in reform" (p. 2). He suggested that this implies ". . . a significant partnership between colleagues who labor in the schools, and colleagues who labor in the colleges. They are inextricably linked" (p. 5). Sizer (1987b) asserted that administrators at Brown University will create a new category of professor called **preceptors**. He explained, "they will be experienced teachers selected through a national search who have part responsibilities in the private and public schools and part in classroom working with prospective teachers at Brown University" (p. 16).

There appears to be little empirical research to quantitatively corroborate the desirability of this kind of reform movement (Pitsch, 1991a). Indeed, according to Pitsch (1991a, p. 12), ". . . because the school-college collaboration movement has only recently begun to achieve a critical mass, it is difficult to gauge its impact." Hall (1986, p. 7) detected the void in this dichotomy when he noted, "There needs to be clear . . . distinction between research on teaching and research on teacher education." Pitsch (1991b, p. 19) also noted a higher education bill on the horizon for teacher training in which he described "participating elementary and secondary schools would link up with a college or university, develop a method of evaluating teachers' performance, and be encouraged to work closely with local social-service agencies, businesses and other community organizations."

On a parenthetical note about businesses, media entrepreneur Whittle has unveiled plans to redesign schools for the 21st century that can deliver a more cost effective education than the average cost per

student of around $5,638 per year (Walsh, 1991, p. 14). Acccordingly, he plans to accrue 3 billion in capital and hire 100 experts to design 200 private schools for profit (Barrett, 1991, p. 14). Whittle has characterized teachers as "caring people who are as miserable as 'Stalin's soldiers'" (cited in Walsh, 1991, p. 14). But Kaplan (1991, p. 36) countered with, ". . . but who really trusts them (businesses)? They have had trouble enough keeping themselves afloat."

The News on Reform Is Not All Bad

Many reform proposals are based upon three premises of teacher education programs -- the academic competence of pre-service teachers is weak; teacher education programs are academically diluted; and these programs do not provide enough clinical field work. (Bull, 1987) Bull conducted an extensive study of 16 teacher preparation institutions in the state of Washington. Collecting and analyzing data on these three variables, Bull concluded that the three premises were erroneous for the state of Washington. The premises did not withstand careful scrutiny.

However, Washington's State Board of Education called for the creation of a valid program-exit exam and a student teaching observation instrument, both consistent with the state's competency requirements. But these measures still must be demonstrated to be accurate predictors of beginning teachers' success.

It was found in all these RATE studies that most faculty and students assessed very positively, the overall pre-service teacher preparation programs with which they were affiliated (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1990, RATE III, p. 31).

REFERENCE LIST - QUALITY OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Books

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1992). Rate V teaching teachers: Facts and figures. Washington, D.C.: Author.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1990). Rate IV teaching teachers: Facts and figures. Washington, D.C.: Author.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1991). Resource review: Assessment issues in teacher education (1983-1990). ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.: Author.

Bey, T.M. & Holmes, C.T. (Eds.). (1990). Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990c). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Goodlad, J.I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K.A. (Eds.). (1990). Places where teachers are taught. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Herbst, J. (1989). And sadly teach: Teacher education and professionalization in American culture. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author

Reform Efforts Will Fail Unless . . .

Many educators who are urging reform efforts noted their skepticism and chances of success. In his book The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform, Sarason (1990) cogently argued that reform efforts are destined to failure unless they take into account the extant and ever changing power relationships that occur in school district systems. Sarason (1990) also suggested that reform efforts will fail if two other issues are not accommodated. He noted, "Schools are uninteresting places where students are required to learn concepts with little relevance to the outside world. Teachers continue to teach subject matter, not children" (p. xiv). His predictions are based upon the dismal results of former reform efforts.

Eubanks and Parish (1990) offered another premise for school reform demise. They asserted that ". . . teacher preparation programs and schooling might be disconnected as a way of guaranteeing that they produce the same dreadful outcomes for the poor and minorities that schooling in America has produced for 300 years" (p. 197). They felt that too many educators are interested in maintaining the privileged status of the majority American culture to warrant restructuring of sufficient depth and quality.

Wise (1990) asserted that the success of school reform is inexorably linked to the public's trust of teachers, "and that trust will not develop until all teachers are well educated and carefully licensed" (p. 202).

Holtz, H., Marcus, I., Dougherty, J., Michaels, J., & Peduzzi, R. (Eds.). (1989). Education and the American dream. (Critical Studies in Education Series), Granby, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Howey, K.R. and Zimpher, N.L. (1989). Profiles of preservice teacher education: Inquiry into the nature of programs. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Johnson, R., Prus, J., Andersen, C.J., & El-Khawas, E. (1991). Assessing Assessment. Higher Education Panel Report Number 79, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Johnston, J.S., Jr. & Associates. (1989). Those Who Can: Undergraduate programs to prepare arts and sciences majors for teaching. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Murphy, J. (Ed.). (1990). The educational reform movement of the 1980s. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

National Commission of Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Odell, S.J. (1990). Mentor teacher programs. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Sarason, S.B. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sarason, S.B., Davidson, K.S., & Blatt, B. (1986). The preparation of teachers: An unstudied problem in education (rev. ed.). Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books, Inc.

Sears, J.T. & Marshall, J. D. (Eds.). (1990). Teaching and thinking about curriculum: Critical inquiries. New York: Teachers College Press.

Toombs, W. & Tierney, W. (1992). Meeting the mandate: Renewing the college and department curriculum. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports 91-6, Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University.

Journal Articles

Aksamit, D., Hall, S.P. & Ryan, L. (1990). Naturalistic inquiry applied to the evaluation of a teacher education program. Teaching and Teacher Education, 6(3), 215-226.

Altschuld, J.W. (1991). This issue. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 2.

Altschuld, J.W. & Thomas, P.M. (1991). The teaching of evaluation: 25 years of growth and change. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 22-29.

Apple, M.W. (1990). Is there a curriculum voice to reclaim? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 526-530.

Barth, R.S. (1990). A personal vision of a good school. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 512-516.

Bowers, J.J. (1991). Evaluating testing programs at the state and local levels. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 52-60.

Boyer, E. (1991). Challenge for the 1990s. Proteus, 8(1), 1-2.

Bracey, G.W. (1990). Research: Looking to the experts. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 559-562.

Brandt, R. (1988). On assessment of teaching: A conversation with Lee Shulman. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 44-46.

Bull, B. (1987). Confronting reform in teacher preparation: One state's experience. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 47(1), 35-40.

Clark, J.M. (1989). Reconciliation of data on aptitude test scores and university grades of teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(4), 49-51.

Cohen, D. (1990). More voices in Babel? Educational research and the politics of curriculum. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 518-522.

Conley, S.C. & Bacharach, S.B. (1990). From school-site management to participatory school-site management. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 539-544.

DiGeronimo, J. (1988). Let's not shortchange the next generation of teachers. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 25.

Dill, V.S. (1990). Support for the unsupportable. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(3), 198-199.

Eastmond, N. (1991). Educational evaluation: The future. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 74-79.

Editor. (1990, Summer). Creating a profession of teaching: The role of national board certification. American Educator, 14 8-12.

Edmonton, P.J. (1990). A normative look at the curriculum in teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(9), 717-722.

Eisele, C. (1990). Too bright to be a teacher educator. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 556-558.

Eisner, E.W. (1990). Who decides what schools teach? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 523-526.

Engel, J.B. (1989). Preserving quality: Teacher training from a liberal arts perspective. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(6), 475-477.

Eubanks, E. & Parish, R. (1990). Why does the status quo persist? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(3), 196-197.

Frisbie, R.D. (1991). New directions in evaluation: A school district perspective. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 46-51.

Ginsberg, R. & Berry, B. (1990). Experiencing school reform: The view from South Carolina. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 549-552.

Glasnapp, D.R. & Poggio, J.P. (1991). Mandated competency testing programs: Evaluating state and local initiatives. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 61-68.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990a). Better teachers for our nation's schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(3), 185-194.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990b). Studying the education of educators: From conception to findings. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(9), 698-701.

Greene, J.C. & McClintock, C. (1991). The evolution of evaluation methodology. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 13-21.

Healy, J.M. (1990) Chaos on Sesame Street. American Educator, 14, 22-27,39.

Hockersmith, P. E. (1991). Introduction -- Profiles in teaching: A celebration. Proteus, 8(1), vi-viii.

Hutchings, P. & Marchese, T. (1990). Watching assessment: Questions, stories, prospects. Change, _____, 12-38.

Kagan, D.M. (1991). Builders of wooden boats and the reform of teacher education: A parable. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(9), 675-677.

Katzenmeyer, C.G. (1991). Singing the same old tune: Federal evaluation policy and the program effectiveness panel. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 69-73.

Kennedy, M.M. (1991). Policy issues in teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 72,(9), 659-665.

Lanier, J.E. & Featherstone, J. (1988). A new commitment to teacher education. Educational Leadership, 46,(3), 18-22.

Lewis, A.C. (1990). Getting unstuck: Curriculum as a tool of reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 534-538.

Livingston, C. & Borko, H. (1989). Expert-novice differences in teaching: A cognitive analysis and implications for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(4), 36-42.

McClenney, K.M. (1990, September/October). Whether assessment? Commitments needed for meaningful change. Change, 22(5), 54.

McKibbin, M.D. (1988). Alternative teacher certification programs. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 32-35.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

McNeil, L.M. (1990). Reclaiming a voice: American curriculum scholars and the politics of what is taught in schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 517-518.

Meade, E.J., Jr. (1991). Reshaping the clinical phase of teacher preparation. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(9), 666-669.

Meadows, B.J. (1990). The rewards and risks of shared leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 545-548.

Meek, A. (1988). On teaching as a profession: A conversation with Linda Darling-Hammond. Educational Leadership, 46(3) 11-17.

Millwood, R.E. and Gerlach, G.J. (1991). Assessing prospective teachers. Scholars, 2(2), 1-4.

Nagel, N. (1988). One university's response to teacher education reform. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 23-24.

Opp, R.D. (1989). Freshmen interest in teaching: Recent trends. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(4), 43-48.

Ory, J.C. (1991). Changes in evaluating teaching in higher education. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 30-36.

Powell, A. (1990). A glimpse at teaching conditions in top private schools. American Educator, 14 28-34, 39.

Ross, D.D. (1989). First steps in developing a reflective approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 22-30.

Roth, R. (1989). The teacher education program: An endangered species? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(4), 319-323.

Schlechty, P.C., Ingwerson, D.W., and Brooks, T.I. (1988). Inventing professional development schools. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 28-31.

Shulman, L.S. (1988). A union of insufficiencies: Strategies for teacher assessment in a period of educational reform. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 36-41.

Simpson, W.A. (1985, Spring). Easing the pain of program review: Departments take the initiative. Educational Record, ____

Skolnik, M.L. (1989). How academic program review can foster intellectual conformity and stifle diversity of thought and method. Journal of Higher Education, 60(6), 619-643.

Smith, M.S., O'Day, J., and Cohen, D.K. (1990). National curriculum American style. American Educator, 14, 10-17, 40-47.

Smyth, J. (1989). Developing sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(2), 12-19.

Sparks-Langer, G.M. & Colton, A.B. (1991). Synthesis of research on teachers' reflective thinking. Educational Leadership, 48(6), 37-43.

Travers, E.F. & Sacks, S.R. (1989). Joining teacher education and the liberal arts in the undergraduate curriculum. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(6), 470-474.

Watts, D. (1989). NCATE and Texas eyeball to eyeball: Who will blink? Phi Delta Kappan, 71(4), 311-318.

Weade, G. & Evertson, C.M. (1991). On what can be learned by observing teaching. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 37-45.

Wilson, S. (1990). The secret garden of teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(3), 206-209.

Wise, A. (1990). Policies for reforming teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(3), 200-202.

Wisniewski, R. (1990). Let's get on with it. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(3), 195-196.

Worthen, B.R. & Sanders, J.R. (1991). The changing face of educational evaluation. Theory Into Practice, 30(1), 3-12.

Conferences, Magazines, Newsletters, and Miscellaneous

ACT Assessment Services. (no date given). Productive assessment via transformative planning and action. Iowa City, IA: Author.

American College Testing Program. (1990). College assessment planning. Iowa City, IA: Author

American College Testing Program. (1991). Guidelines for using CAAP in outcomes assessment. Iowa City, IA: Author.

Barrett, M.E. (1991, August 23-25). If schools fail, reinvent them. USA Weekend, p. 14.

Bauer, J. (1992, June). Rural school administrators split on education reforms. Penn Lines, 27(6), 7.

Blumenstyk, G. & Magner, D.K. (1990, July 11). As assessment draws new converts, backers gather to ask 'what works?' The Chronicle of Higher Education, A11.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). Report card on school reform: The teachers speak. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Carnegie Foundation report a 'blockbuster hit'. (1991, September 30). APSCUF Newsletter, 17(9), 2.

Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.) (1987). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College

Cresap, McCormick, & Paget. (1984). Teacher incentives: A tool effective management. (Research paper for The National Association of Secondary School Principals; The National Association of Elementary School Principals, and The American Association of School Administrators). Reston, VA: Author. Schaffarzick (eds.).

Drexler, J. & Stambaugh, P. (1992, June). Firefight over school reform. Penn Lines, 27(6), 4-7.

Ewell, P.T. (no date given). Assessment and the new accountability: A challenge for higher education's leadership. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Hall, G.E. (1986). Beyond the looking glass: Recommendations and critical warnings for teacher education practitioners, policymakers, and researchers. Austin, TX: The Research & Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas.

Johnson, R., Prus, J., Andersen, C.J., & El-Khawas, E. (1991, May). Assessing assessment: An in-depth status report on the higher education assessment movement in 1990. Higher Education Panel Report #79, Washington, D.C.: American Coucil on Education.

Kaplan, G.R. (1991, May 22). Watch out for America 2000; It really is a crusade. Education Week, 36, 27.

Kodish (ed.). (May, 1991). Creating a Profession of Teaching. APSCUF Newsletter

McKenna, B. (1991a). Teacher education. On Campus, 10(5), 7.

McKenna, B. (1991b). The trials of accreditation. On Campus, 11(2), 8-9, 14.

McMahon, E. (1986). The why, what, and who of assessment: The state perspective. Paper presented at the 47th ETS Invitational Conference at the Plaza, New York City on October 25, 1986. ERIC Reproduction Services, ED 284 892.

Meade, E.J., Jr. (1987). Teaching: A career of choice. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College,

Miller, R.I. (1986). Evaluating institutional quality: Some ways and some problems. Paper presented at OCED's Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education, Special Topic Workshop on "The Role of Evaluation in the Management of Institutions of Higher Education" at Paris, France on May 12-14, 1986.

Moore, J.W. (1987). Panel response to Theodore Sizer. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College, pp. 8-9.

Nielsen, R. (1991a). Testing: The WYTIWYG factor. On Campus, 10(5), 16.

Nielsen, R. (1991b). Putting the lecture in its place. On Campus, (10(6), 16.

Orlosky, D.E. (Ed.). (1988). Society, schools, and teacher preparation: A report of the commission on the future education of teachers. (Teacher Education Monograph No. 9). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Pitsch, M. (1991a, September 11). School-college links seen as fundamental to education reform. Education Week, 11(2), 1, 12-13.

Pitsch, M. (1991b, September 11). Teacher training a likely focus of higher-ed bill. Education Week, 11(2), 19.

Rothman, R. (1991, September 11). Experts outline assessment systems to track goals. Education Week, 11(2), 18,20.

Sizer, T.R. (1987a). Response to the panelists. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College, pp. 15-17.

Sizer, T.R. (1987b). The connection between teacher education and school reform. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on

Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College, pp. 1-7.

Spady, W. (1991-1992). The real meaning of outcome-based. The Mainstream, 9(3), p. 2.

Steele, J.M. (no date given). Distinguishing differences: College outcome measures program. American College Testing Program.

Students rank high on national exam. (1991, October 4). FACT, Shippensburg University, 2(16), p. 5.

Tom, A. R. (1987). What are the fundamental problems in the professional education of teachers. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College, pp. 28-33.

Travers, E.F. & Sacks, S.R. (1987). Teacher education and the liberal arts: The position of the consortium for excellence in teacher education. Carbone, M.J. and Wonsiewicz, A. (eds.). Excellence in teacher education through the liberal arts. Proceedings of the Conference on Excellence in Teacher Education through the Liberal Arts, Muhlenberg College, pp. 34-38.

Walsh, M. (1991, May 22). Entrepreneur Whittle unveils plans to create chain of for-profit schools. Education Week, pp. 1, 14.